

Review Proposed Revisions to the *Accreditation Framework*

Professional Services Division

April 11, 2005

The purpose of this item is to provide the COA with a copy of the proposed revisions to the *Accreditation Framework*.

Following are the sections of the proposed revisions to the *Accreditation Framework*:

Overview

Introduction	Introduction, Purposes, and Key Attributes
Section 1	Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission
Section 2	Functions of the Committee on Accreditation
Section 3	Accreditation Standards
Section 4	Initial Accreditation Policies
Section 5	Initial and Continuing Accreditation Reviews
Section 6	Accreditation Policies and Cycle
Section 7	National Accreditation
Section 8	Evaluation and Modification of the Framework

Overview
Proposed Revisions to the Accreditation Framework

Revised Framework Organization	How does new language connect with the Original Framework?	Adopted Accreditation Framework (1995)
Introduction, Purposes, and Key Attributes	Completely reorganized and rewritten. Most of purposes and key attributes (pages 3-7) exist in the new introduction.	Introduction to the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (pages 1-8)
Section 1: Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission	No changes	Section 1: Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission (pages 9-10)
Section 2: Functions of the Committee on Accreditation	Minor changes. Part A 8 and Part C.	Section 2: Functions of the Committee on Accreditation (pages 11-13)
Section 3: Accreditation Standards	Revised to reflect the reduced number and reorganization of options for program standards.	Section 3: Accreditation Standards (pages 14-15)
Section 4: Initial Accreditation Policies	<i>Tracked edits version.</i> Revised to clarify initial institution eligibility to offer programs and initial program accreditation as distinct from continuing accreditation.	Section 4: Initial Accreditation Policies (pages 15-16)
Section 5: Initial and Continuing Accreditation Reviewers	<i>Mainly tracked edits version.</i> Revised to show BIR members involvement at initial program approval, program review and site visits.	Section 5: Continuing Accreditation Teams (pages 17-19)
Section 6: Accreditation Policies and Cycle	New organization due to new structure of accreditation cycle. An outline accompanies the section	Section 6: Continuing Accreditation Policies (pages 19-22)
Section 7: National Accreditation	<i>Tracked edits version.</i> Content is the same, reorganized for clarity	Section 7: National Accreditation (pages 23-24)
Section 8: Evaluation and Modification of the Framework	<i>Tracked edits version.</i> Removed language relating to independent evaluation of system.	Section 8: Evaluation and Modification of the Framework (pages 24-25)

Educator Preparation for California

The Accreditation Framework

This Framework addresses the accreditation of colleges, universities and local education agencies that prepare teachers and other educators for state certification and professional practice in California public schools. Accreditation is the primary assurance of quality in the preparation of professional educators, and as such is an essential purpose of the Commission. It provides an important quality assurance to the education profession, the general public, and the accredited institutions. This Introduction to the Framework articulates the purposes of the accreditation system in the field of educator preparation.

Accreditation of Educator Preparation Programs

The Purposes of Professional Educator Program Accreditation

Professional accreditation is the process of ascertaining and verifying the quality of each program that prepares individuals for state certification. In this context, state certification is the process of ascertaining and verifying the qualifications of each future member of the education profession. These two processes -- professional accreditation and state certification share a common overarching objective -- ensuring that those who teach in California's public school system have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to be effective classroom teachers. Accreditation of educator preparation in California serves to achieve the four primary purposes articulated below. It is the intent of this accreditation system to have an articulated accreditation and program review process across all educator preparation programs in California.

A primary purpose the professional accreditation system is to ensure accountability to the public, the students and the education profession that educator preparation programs are responsive to the educational needs of current and future students in order that students meet or exceed the K-12 academic content standards. Only an accredited teacher preparation program may recommend a candidate for a license to teach in California. The general public has a compelling interest in accreditation decisions that are part of the public education system in California. So do professionals whose work is judged by the accreditation system, or whose future success depends on its results and effectiveness. The expertise and experience of the accreditors should be credible to the general public and the education profession in California.

A second purpose of accreditation is to ensure that educator preparation programs are high quality and effective and provide education and experiences consistent with the knowledge and skills required of an educator serving the needs of the diverse population in the California public schools. The Commission has statutory responsibility for adopting accreditation standards which describe levels of quality that it deems to be acceptable for quality assurance. Standards should not focus on purely technical or operational aspects of educator preparation, but should enable trained reviewers with professional expertise to find out whether educator preparation in an institution is characterized by acceptable levels of quality as defined in the standards.

The Accreditation system should be oriented to issues of quality. During a review, the reviewers need to obtain evidence that relates to the educational quality of preparation programs and policies within the institution. Through experience, expertise and training, the reviewers must be skilled at discerning the important from the unimportant in educator preparation. The findings and recommendations of accreditation reviewers should focus on important matters of quality in the preparation of educators. Accreditation decisions should hinge on findings that are educationally significant and clearly related to quality-oriented standards.

A third purpose of the accreditation system is to ensure adherence to standards. The standards are designed to ensure that each educator's preparation is appropriate to the requirements of professional service

in public schools. California's educator preparation programs must be designed to meet the appropriate Commission approved program standards, which must be aligned with the state adopted academic content and performance standards for K-12 students. Through the accreditation system, educator preparation programs must provide evidence that the programs meet all standards.

Finally, the fourth purpose of the accreditation system is to support program improvement. Accreditation standards, reviews and decisions should contribute to improvements in the preparation of educators. The quality of an institution's policies, practices and outcomes should improve as its faculty, administrators and students strive to meet accreditation standards. The institution's offerings should also benefit from the quality orientation of the accreditation system. When these effects of accreditation fall short, however, specific accreditation decisions should also provoke needed improvements in educator preparation institutions. For improvements to occur, the accreditation system must identify and describe weaknesses in the quality of an institution's offerings in preparing professionals to serve the needs of California's diverse student population.

Key Attributes of Accreditation of California's Educator Preparation Programs

The key attributes described below function within the four purposes of accreditation. These attributes pertain to the development of program standards, the initial program approval process, and the subsequent reviews and accreditation of educator preparation programs.

First Attribute: The Professional Character of Accreditation. Professional educators should hold themselves and their peers accountable for the quality of professional education. Professionals should be involved intensively in the entire accreditation process. They should create accreditation standards, conduct accreditation reviews, and make accreditation decisions. Participants in these aspects of accreditation should have experience, expertise and training that are appropriate for their specific roles in accreditation. In each step of accreditation, decisions should emerge from consultative procedures, and should reflect the consensus of the professional participants.

Second Attribute: Knowledgeable Participants. The effectiveness of the accreditation system relies on the quality of the decision making at each step in the process. Quality assurances are provided initially through the participation of individuals who possess knowledge, skills and broad expertise and who participate in the system in various roles, including policy development, policy implementation, program review, system support and technical management, and professional preparation. In order to fulfill these roles effectively, participants must receive appropriate, targeted training that enables them to understand the underlying principles and purposes of the system as well as how to enact each of these roles effectively in meeting the needs of all learners in California's schools.

Third Attribute: Breadth and Flexibility. For institutions to be effective in a dynamic state like California, they must be creative and responsive to the changing needs of prospective educators. In a society as diverse as California, universities and colleges often vary substantially in their missions and philosophies. Accreditation should not force institutions to conform to prescribed patterns unless these conventions have a firm basis in principles of educational quality, effectiveness and equity. The accreditation system should accommodate breadth and flexibility within and among institutions to support program improvement.

Accreditation standards should be drawn so different institutions can meet them in a variety of acceptable ways. There are acceptable and unacceptable forms of educator preparation; accreditation should differentiate between them. There are also multiple ways of educating prospective educators acceptably; accreditation should not favor any of these over the others. Standards should describe levels of quality and effectiveness without stipulating how institutions are to comply. Explanations of the standards should clarify their meaning without making the standards overly restrictive. The training of accreditation reviewers should, moreover, emphasize the importance of acknowledging institutional diversity and creativity.

Fourth Attribute: Intensity in Accreditation. Accreditation should focus with intensity on key aspects of educational quality and effectiveness. While allowing and encouraging divergence among programs and institutions, the process should also be exacting in assembling key information about critical aspects of educational quality and effectiveness. The scope of accreditation should be comprehensive, and the information generated by the review processes should be sufficient to yield reliable judgments by professional educators.

Accreditation standards should encompass the critical dimensions of educator preparation. In order to recommend an institution for accreditation, experienced professional reviewers should be satisfied that the institution provides a comprehensive array of excellent learning opportunities and assurances that future educators have demonstrated that they have attained the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to be effective professionals..

Accreditation decisions should be based on information that is sufficient in breadth and depth for the results to be credible and dependable. Accreditation reviewers should understand the components of the program under review and the types of standards-based evidence that substantiate its overall quality and effectiveness. To find out if broad, quality-oriented standards are met, and to make reliable judgments and sound recommendations, reviewers need to assemble a considerable body of data that is collectively significant.

Fifth Attribute: Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness. An accreditation system should fulfill its purposes efficiently and cost-effectively. Review procedures, decision processes and reporting relationships should be streamlined and economical. Participants' roles should be clearly defined, and communications should be efficient.

There are costs associated with establishing standards, training reviewers, assembling information, preparing reports, conducting meetings and checking the accuracy of data and the fairness of decisions. Containing these costs is an essential attribute of accreditation, but efficiency must not undermine the capacity of accreditors to fulfill their responsibilities to the public and the profession. Accreditation costs, which are borne by institutions, individual accreditors and the accrediting body, should be reviewed periodically by the Commission in relation to the key purposes of accreditation.

Section 1

Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Pertaining to the accreditation of educator preparation, the authority and responsibilities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing include the following.

A. Responsibilities Related to Accreditation Policies

1. **Adopt and Modify the Accreditation Framework.** The Commission has the authority and responsibility to adopt an *Accreditation Framework*, “which sets forth the policies of the Commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California” (Education Code Section 44372-a). The present document is the adopted *Accreditation Framework*. The Commission may modify the *Framework* in accordance with Section 8 of the *Framework*. Modifications occur in public meetings after the Commission considers relevant information provided by the Committee on Accreditation, institutions, accreditation team members, the Commission’s staff, and other concerned individuals. The Commission determines when a policy modification takes effect.
2. **Establish and Modify Standards for Educator Preparation.** Pursuant to Education Code Section 44372-b, the Commission has the authority and responsibility to establish and modify standards for educator preparation in California.

B. Responsibilities Related to Accreditation Decisions

1. **Initial Accreditation of Institutions.** In accordance with Education Code Sections 44227-a and 44372-c and Section 4 of this *Framework*, the Commission determines the eligibility of an institution that applies for initial accreditation and that has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California. The Commission accredits institutions that meet the criteria that have been adopted for that purpose by the Commission. Institutional accreditation by the Commission establishes the eligibility of an institution to submit specific program proposals to the Committee on Accreditation.
2. **Hear and Resolve Accreditation Appeals.** The Commission hears appeals of accreditation decisions, which must be based on evidence that accreditation procedures or decisions were “arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies of the Commission or the procedural guidelines of the Committee on Accreditation” (Education Code Section 44374-e). The Commission resolves each appeal, and the Executive Director communicates the Commission’s decision to the Committee on Accreditation, the accreditation team, and the affected institution.

C. Responsibilities Related to the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Establish a Nominating Panel.** In collaboration with the Committee on Accreditation, the Commission establishes a Nominating Panel to solicit and screen nominations and recommend educators to serve on the Committee on Accreditation.
2. **Appoint the Committee on Accreditation.** Pursuant to Education Code 44372-d and Section 2 of this *Framework*, the Commission appoints members and alternate members of the Committee on Accreditation for specific terms. The Commission selects the Committee members and alternate members from nominees submitted by the Nominating Panel. The Commission ensures that the Committee on Accreditation is professionally distinguished and balanced in its composition, but does not appoint members to represent particular institutions, organizations or constituencies.
3. **Address Issues and Refer Concerns Related to Accreditation.** The Commission considers issues and concerns related to accreditation that it identifies, as well as those brought to the Commission's attention by the Committee on Accreditation, postsecondary institutions, the Commission's staff, or other concerned individuals or organizations. At its discretion, the Commission may refer accreditation issues and concerns to the Committee on Accreditation for examination and response.
4. **Review Annual Reports by the Committee on Accreditation.** The Commission reviews *Annual Accreditation Reports* submitted by the Committee on Accreditation. *Annual Reports* include standard information about the dimensions and results of the accreditation process. *Annual Reports* may also identify the Committee's issues and concerns, but these may be presented to the Commission separately from the *Annual Reports*.

D. Responsibilities Related to the Accreditation System

1. **Allocate Resources Annually for Accreditation Operations.** The Commission annually allocates resources for accreditation operations to implement this *Accreditation Framework*. Consistent with the Commission's general practice, staff assignments to accreditation operations are made by the Executive Director, in accordance with state budgets, laws and regulations.
2. **Review and Sponsor Legislation Related to Accreditation.** The Commission reviews legislative proposals to amend the Education Code related to the accreditation of educator preparation institutions. As the need arises, the Commission sponsors legislation related to accreditation, after considering the advice of the Commission's professional staff, the Committee on Accreditation, educational institutions and professional organizations.

Section 2

Functions of the Committee on Accreditation

The functions, membership and appointment of the Committee on Accreditation are set forth in Education Code Section 44373 and this section.

A. Functions of the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Comparability of Standards.** In accordance with Section 3 of this *Framework*, the Committee determines whether standards submitted by institutions under Option 2 (National or Professional Program Standards) or Option 3 (Alternative Program Standards), taken as a whole, provide a level of program quality comparable to standards adopted by the Commission under Option 1 (California Program Standards). If the Committee determines that the proposed standards are collectively comparable in breadth and depth, when taken as a whole, to the Commission-adopted standards, the Committee on Accreditation may approve the proposed standards as Program Standards in California.
2. **Initial Accreditation of Programs.** The Committee reviews proposals for the initial accreditation of programs submitted by institutions that have been determined eligible by the Commission. New programs of educator preparation may be submitted under Options One, Two, or Three in Section 3. If the Committee determines that a program meets all applicable standards, the Committee grants initial accreditation to the program.
3. **Continuing Accreditation Decisions.** After reviewing the recommendations of accreditation teams and the responses of institutions, the Committee makes decisions about the continuing accreditation of educator preparation institutions and programs, consistent with Section 6 of this *Framework*. Pertaining to each institution, the Committee makes one of three decisions: Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, or Denial of Accreditation.
4. **Accreditation Procedures.** Consistent with the terms of Section 6, the Committee recommends appropriate guidelines for self-study reports and other accreditation materials and exhibits to be prepared by institutions. The Committee also adopts guidelines for accreditation team reports, which emphasize the use of narrative, qualitative explanations of team recommendations. The Committee may provide additional guidance to institutions, teams and the Executive Director regarding accreditation visit procedures. The procedural guidelines of the Committee are published by the Commission as an *Accreditation Handbook*.
5. **Monitor the Accreditation System.** The Committee monitors the performance of accreditation teams and oversees other activities associated with the accreditation system.

6. **Annual Reports, Recommendations and Responses.** The Committee presents *Annual Accreditation Reports* to the Commission. *Annual Reports* include standard information about the dimensions and results of the accreditation process. The Committee also advises the Commission about policy changes to improve the quality and integrity of the accreditation process.
7. **Meet in Public Sessions.** The Committee conducts its business and makes its decisions in meetings that are open to the public, except as provided by statute.
8. **Evaluation of Accreditation Policies and Practices.** The Committee shares responsibility with the Commission for the on going evaluation and monitoring of the effectiveness of the accreditation system. Evaluation and monitoring of the system as well as modification to that system will be conducted in a manner consistent with Section 8 of this Framework.

B. Membership of the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Membership Composition.** The Committee consists of twelve members. Six members are from postsecondary education institutions, and six are certificated professionals in public schools, school districts, or county offices of education in California. Selection of members is based on the breadth of their experience, the diversity of their perspectives, and "their distinguished records of accomplishment in education" (Education Code Section 44373-a). All members serve as members-at-large. No member serves on the Committee as a representative of any organization, institution, or constituency. To the maximum extent possible, Committee membership is balanced according to ethnicity, gender, geographic regions and across credentials awarded by the Commission. The Committee includes members from elementary and secondary schools, and from public and private postsecondary institutions. The elementary and secondary school members include certificated administrators, teachers, and at least one member involved in a professional educator preparation program. The postsecondary members include administrators and faculty members, both of whom must be involved in professional educator programs.
2. **Membership Criteria.** The criteria for membership on the Committee are: evidence of achievement in the education profession; recognized professional or scholarly contributions in the field of education; recognition of excellence by peers; experience with and sensitivity to issues of human diversity; distinguished service in the field of educator preparation; knowledge of issues related to the preparation and licensing of education professionals; length of professional service; and possession of appropriate educational degrees and professional credentials.

C. Appointment of the Committee on Accreditation

1. **Nominating Panel.** A Nominating Panel of four distinguished members of the education profession in California identifies and nominates individuals to serve on the

Committee on Accreditation. The Nominating Panel is comprised of two educators appointed by the Committee on Accreditation and two educators appointed by the Commission. Each entity will appoint one college or university member and one elementary or secondary school member to the Nominating Panel. The terms of Nominating Panel members are four years long. Members of the Panel may not serve more than one term.

2. **Nomination of Committee Members.** To select members for the Committee on Accreditation, a vacancy notice is posted on the CTC website and nominations are solicited, in writing, from a broad base of professional organizations, agencies, institutions, and individuals in education. Each nomination must be submitted with the consent of the individual. A written endorsement from the nominee's employer confirming understanding of and agreement to the nominee's participation on the Committee must be submitted (CTC provides travel, per diem, and substitute reimbursement, if needed). The nominee's professional resume must be submitted. Self-nominations are not accepted.
3. **Selection of Committee Members.** Based on the membership criteria and the principles of balanced composition set forth in this section, the Nominating Panel recommends for appointment highly qualified nominees who are drawn equally from colleges and universities and elementary and secondary schools. The Nominating Panel recommends applicants equal to twice the number of vacancies. The Commission selects and appoints the members and alternate members of the Committee by selecting from the nominations submitted by the Panel.
4. **Terms of Appointment.** The Commission appoints members of the Committee on Accreditation to four-year terms. A member may be re-nominated and reappointed to a second term of four years. A member may serve a maximum of two terms on the Committee.
5. **Selection of Subsequent Committee Members.** Annually, prior to the conclusion of the Committee members' terms, the Nominating Panel, following procedures delineated in 2 and 3 above, again submits, solicits, reviews and recommends nominations to the Commission. The Panel submits twice as many nominees as the number of pending vacancies on the Committee.
6. **Committee Vacancies.** When a seat on the Committee becomes vacant prior to the conclusion of the member's term, the Executive Director fills the seat for the remainder of the term by appointing a replacement from the list of alternate members.
7. **Transition from *Accreditation Framework (1995)* to the revised Framework (2005) as it applies to Committee membership.** In the first year of the implementation of the revised Framework, three new members will be appointed to the Committee, for four year terms. Nine members of the prior Committee will continue to serve, three for one additional year, three for two additional years, and three for three additional years. Each subsequent year, three additional members will be appointed to the Committee.

Section 3

Accreditation Standards

There are two categories of accreditation standards for institutions that prepare professional educators in California. An accredited institution is expected to satisfy the standards in both categories.

Category I. Common Standards relate to aspects of program quality that are the same for all educator preparation programs. This category includes standards regarding the overall leadership and climate for educator preparation at an institution, as well as standards pertaining to quality features that are common to all programs such as resources, coordination, admissions and advisement. An institution responds to each Common Standard by providing pertinent information, including information about individual programs. The Common Standards are in Appendix 2 of this *Framework*.

Category II. Program Standards address the quality of program features that are specific to a credential, such as curriculum, field experiences, and knowledge and skills to be demonstrated by candidates in the specific credential area. When institutions prepare for continuing accreditation reviews, they may consider the following options for program-specific standards. Different options may be exercised by different credential programs at an institution. Options that are selected will be the basis for the review of specific programs by accreditation teams, and will guide the selection and orientation of team members. Pertaining to each program, the institution responds to each standard in the selected option by providing program-specific information for review by the accreditation team.

- **Option 1. California Program Standards.** The Commission continues to rely on panels of experts from colleges, universities and schools to develop standards for specific credential programs. These panels are guided by current research findings in the field of the credential. They also consider standards developed by appropriate national and statewide professional organizations. If the national or professional standards are found to be appropriate for California, a panel may recommend that the Commission adopt them in lieu of developing new standards or revising the Commission's existing standards. After reviewing the recommendations of advisory panels and other experts, the Commission adopts California Program Standards for the initial and continuing accreditation of credential preparation programs. The Commission may require that a new set of California Program Standards be met by each institution that prepares candidates for a credential.
- **Option 2. National or Professional Program Standards.** California institutions may propose program standards that have been developed by national or state professional organizations. Such a proposal may be submitted to the Committee on Accreditation with a statement of the institution's reasons for selecting this option and recommending the proposed standards. If the Committee determines that the recommended standards, taken as a whole, provide a level of professional quality comparable to the standards adopted by the Commission under Option 1 (California Program Standards), the Committee approves the proposed standards for use as Program Standards in the initial or continuing accreditation of credential programs.

- **Option 3. Alternate Program Standards.**

- A) Experimental Program Standards** For initial accreditation, an institution may present an experimental, pilot, or exploratory program that meets the Experimental Program Standards adopted by the Commission pursuant to Education Code Section 44273. Experimental, pilot, or exploratory programs are designed to allow for the examination of focused research questions intended to contribute to the body of knowledge around key aspects of the field of education including the identification of model strategies, delivery methods, and programs that lead to improved teaching and learning. Institutions that sponsor experimental, pilot, or exploratory programs must have a research component that examines how the program contributes to the development of quality teaching and specifically, the acquisition and mastery by teacher candidates of appropriate performance expectations, such as the Teaching Performance Expectations for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials. In addition, experimental, pilot, or exploratory programs are required to report their findings on a biennial basis to the Commission, which disseminates the results to other institutions in California. Upon consultation with the institution and with the Committee on Accreditation, the Commission retains the authority to determine whether the findings support continuance of the experimental, pilot, or exploratory program under the experimental standards.
- B) Alternative Standards** An institution may develop Alternative Standards for initial and continuing accreditation of a credential program. The institution must submit a sound rationale for the alternative program. If the Committee on Accreditation determines that the proposed standards, taken as a whole, provide a level of program quality comparable to the standards adopted by the Commission under Option 1 (California Program Standards), the Committee approves the Alternative Standards for use as Program Standards by the institution that proposed them.

Section 4

Initial Accreditation Policies

This section governs the initial accreditation of institutions and programs.

A. Responsibility for Two Types of Initial Accreditation Recognition

1. **Initial Eligibility Accreditation of Institutions/Program Sponsors.** A postsecondary education institution *or school district* that has not previously been declared eligible to offer credential preparation programs must submit an application to the Commission for initial *recognition* ~~professional accreditation~~. Institutional accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) *or another of the six regional accrediting bodies or evidence of the entity's governance board's approval or sponsorship of the program* is required for initial *recognition* ~~professional accreditation~~ by the Commission *establishing eligibility to submit programs for further consideration*. The Commission may establish additional procedures and criteria for the initial ~~professional accreditation~~ *recognition* of institutions to prepare and recommend candidates for state credentials in education.
2. **Initial Accreditation of Programs.** New credential program proposals by institutions that have been determined to be eligible by the Commission must fulfill preconditions established by state law and the Commission, the Common Standards, and ~~a~~ *the appropriate* set of Program Standards. Descriptions of new programs include evidence of involvement in program design and planning by elementary and secondary school practitioners and members of diverse local communities. The Committee on Accreditation decides the initial accreditation of new credential programs at an eligible institution/*sponsor*.

B. Policies for Initial Accreditation of Programs

1. **Review of New Programs.** Prior to being presented to the Committee for action, new programs proposed by eligible program sponsors are reviewed in relation to the Common Standards in Appendix 2 and the selected Program Standards as specified in Section 3 of this *Framework*. The Committee considers recommendations by the staff and the external reviewers regarding the accreditation of each proposed program.
2. **Institutional Standards.** An institution/*program sponsor* that selects National or Professional Program Standards (Option 2) or *utilizes* Alternative Program Standards (Option 3) submits the standards to the Committee on Accreditation for initial approval prior to developing a program proposal. The acceptability of the standards is assured before the *sponsor* prepares a program proposal.
3. **Experimental Programs.** The Committee on Accreditation accredits experimental programs by applying standards adopted by the Commission relating to:
 - submission of research questions, hypotheses or objectives related to the selection, preparation or assessment of prospective professional educators;

- submission of a research design applicable to the research questions, hypotheses or objectives being investigated; and
- demonstration of the potential effectiveness of the proposed program in generally improving the quality of service authorized by the credential.

4. Alternative Programs. The Committee on Accreditation accredits alternative programs by applying standards adopted by the Commission relating to:

- the overall quality of alternative standards developed by the institution, which must have educational merit generally equivalent or superior to standards set by the Commission as Option 1;
- the requirement that extended alternative programs adhere to standards of professional competence that exceed those set by the Commission for conventional teacher education programs; and
- a recommendation that alternative programs that lead to Multiple or Single Subject Teaching credentials be designed to integrate the delivery of subject matter preparation and pedagogical preparation over the entire period of each candidate's initial preparation as a teacher.

Section 5

Initial and Continuing Accreditation Reviewers

This section governs the *initial and continuing accreditation reviewers of institutions* in California.

A. Board of Institutional Reviewers

~~**Pool of Trained Reviewers.**~~ To conduct reviews for the *initial and continuing accreditation of educator preparation institutions/institutions/program sponsors*, the Executive Director of the Commission maintains a pool of trained reviewers consisting of California college and university faculty members and administrators, elementary and secondary school teachers and other certificated professionals, and local school board members, pursuant to Education Code Section 44374(b). The pool consists of approximately ~~400~~ 200 persons who are geographically and culturally diverse, and who represent gender equity. The Committee on Accreditation establishes criteria for membership in the pool. The Executive Director adds new members to the pool from time to time.

New Reviewers. For the most part, an accreditation team consists of experienced reviewers. A team need not include an inexperienced member, but new reviewers are appointed to *review activities* after their training, when appropriate.

Conflict of Interest. Care is exercised to avoid conflicts of interest involving accreditation team members and the institution/*sponsor* being reviewed. No member of a team shall have ties to the institution/*sponsor*, such as current or past enrollment there, programmatic collaboration, past or present employment, or spousal connections.

B. Team Structure, Size and Expertise.

1. ***Initial Program Approval:*** New programs may be reviewed by Commission staff members who have expertise in the credential area. If the Commission staff does not possess the necessary expertise, the program proposals may be reviewed by external experts selected by the Executive Director. *New programs are reviewed by one to two reviewers.*
2. ***Continuing Program Accreditation Review:*** *For each program being considered for continuing accreditation, the Executive Director appoints a program review team. Programs may be reviewed in groups of like programs, (clusters) and cluster members are responsible for reviewing a group of credential programs from the same program sponsor. The team will prepare a report to the COA containing its findings on standards and accreditation recommendations. The size of clusters ranges from two to five members, depending on the number of programs being reviewed. Team members with appropriate experience and qualifications are responsible for professional judgments about credential programs. Reviewers assigned to a cluster should have sufficient expertise to make sound judgments about programs in the cluster.*
3. ***Continuing Institutional Accreditation:*** *For an institution/sponsor being considered for continuing accreditation, the Executive Director appoints a site accreditation team and designates a team leader. The accreditation team members have responsibility for reviewing the Common Standards and either confirming or altering the findings from the program reviews. The size of the site review team ranges from three to seven members,*

depending on the enrollment, complexity of programs, and satellite locations. One to two members will have primary responsibility for the program findings. Additional members of the site accreditation team may be added by the COA as a result of its review of the sponsor's programs.

- 4. Team Expertise.** The range of credential programs at an institution/sponsor must be reflected in the expertise of the reviewers, but there need not be a one-to-one correspondence between credential programs and reviewer specializations. *Student enrollments in programs, the complexity of programs, and/or the numbers of specialized programs offered by an institution will all be considered when both program and site teams are created¹. The nature of the preliminary findings will also be considered in establishing the site team.* At least one member of each institution's site team has a depth of expertise in the multicultural, diversity and language acquisition needs of California classrooms.

¹ Student enrollment is a factor because the team must complete a sufficient sample of interviews in order to make valid, reliable judgments about issues of quality. Complexity may be a factor if an institution operates diverse programs, or if programs are offered at geographically dispersed locations or in colleges outside the education unit.

B. ~~Organization and Expertise of Continuing Accreditation Activities~~

- 1. Coordination and Communication between the Program Review and the Site Review Teams.** *Clear and timely communication from the program review teams to the Committee on Accreditation and from the Committee on Accreditation to the sponsor and site team is essential.*
- 2. Team Leader.** The Executive Director appoints an experienced reviewer as the leader of a *sponsor's site* team for continuing accreditation. The leader's roles are to assist the Commission's staff consultant in planning the review, participate in team size and composition decisions, and provide leadership in team training, orientation and support during the accreditation review. The team leader and the Commission's staff consultant are jointly responsible for management of the review.
- ~~**2. Cluster Leaders.** The team leader and staff consultant select a member of each cluster to serve as cluster leader, whose role is to help in organizing and managing the cluster's activities during the review.~~
- ~~**3. Site Review Team Common Standards Cluster.** The Common Standards are reviewed by a team of reviewers, including members who are able to make judgments about the education unit. This cluster may include *among others*, a dean, associate dean, university unit director (when a smaller institution has a department rather than a school of education) and/or a superintendent of a school district or county office of education.~~
- ~~**4. Team Assignments.** Team members are trained in reviewing the Common Standards and/or the selected Program Standards. A single cluster of reviewers is not normally given primary responsibility for reviewing the Common Standards and Program Standards in the same review.~~

- ~~5. **Team Continuity.** When possible and when appropriate to the programs at one or more institutions to be visited, members of previously successful teams are kept together for the purpose of reviewing more than one institution.~~

C. Training and Orientation for Accreditation Reviews

Prior to participation in an accreditation review *activities*, team members, cluster leaders and team leaders participate in two kinds of in-depth training and orientation.

1. **BIR Team Training.** To ensure that accreditation reviews examine issues of quality in preparation, team members participate in an intensive ~~three-day~~ training program, which focuses on *document review*, *data analysis*, team skills, interview techniques, accreditation procedures, and the consistent application of standards. In adopting an *Accreditation Handbook*, the Committee on Accreditation will attend to appropriate differentiation in the training of new and returning team members, cluster leaders and team leaders *and training for the three different types of review activities: Initial Program Approval, Continuing Program Review, and Continuing Institutional Accreditation Review. The Board of Institutional Reviewers will have members involved in all three types of review activities.*

2. Team Orientation.

Initial Program Approval: As new program standards are adopted, and documents are then submitted, a Commission staff member will be assigned to the program. The staff member will ensure calibration of reader responses to the standards and work with all reviewers to ensure that all programs documents submitted for initial program approval are reviewed in an equitable manner.

Continuing Program Review: Updates will be provided to BIR members regarding program review on a regular basis. Program Reviewers may meet regionally to review program documents. At such a meeting, a Commission staff consultant will be present.

Continuing Institutional Accreditation Review: On the day prior to the beginning of an accreditation site visit, team members meet to discuss their observations about the institutional self-study report, the *preliminary program standard findings*, review their prior training as team members, and thoroughly plan the team activities for the accreditation review under the team leader ~~and cluster leaders.~~

3. ***Evaluation of Training and Accreditation Activities.*** To ensure that future team trainings and orientations are effective, all team members will be asked to evaluate both training and orientation activities. The Committee on Accreditation will analyze the responses and modify the trainings appropriately.

Section 6 - Continuing Accreditation Policies and Cycle Outline

- A. Accreditation Handbook
 - 1. Accreditation Procedures-**NEW**
 - 2. Standard and Related Options—Original paragraph A 1, modified to align with Section 3
 - 3. Guidelines for Reports—Original paragraph A 2
- B. Accreditation Cycle--**NEW**
Outline of Cycle
- C. Continuing Program Reports-**NEW**
 - 1. Biennial Report.
 - 2. Institutional Summary.
 - 3. Review of Information.
 - 4. Action by Committee on Accreditation.
- D. Continuing Program Accreditation-**NEW**
 - 1. Updated Document
 - 2. Data considered during the program review
 - 3. Review of Information
 - 4. Program Review Guides Site Visit
- E. Continuing Institutional Accreditation
 - 1. Preliminary Report-(Modification of paragraph B 1)
 - 2. Report of Program Document Review-**NEW**
 - 3. Institutional Self Study (Original paragraph B 2)
 - 4. The Site Visit (Original paragraphs C 2-5)
 - a. Collection of Information
 - b. Procedural Safeguards
 - c. Specialized Credential Program Team
 - d. Exit Interview and Report
 - 5. Accreditation Reports, Recommendations and Decisions (Original paragraphs D 1-4)
 - a. Accreditation Team Reports
 - b. Accreditation Team Recommendations
 - c. Accreditation Decisions
 - d. Required Follow-up-**NEW**
 - e. Accreditation with Stipulations
- F. Appeals (Original paragraphs E 1-2)
 - 1. Appeals to the Committee on Accreditation
 - 2. Appeals to the Commission
- G. Concerns about Credential Program Quality (Original paragraph F)

Section 6

Continuing Accreditation Policies and Cycle

The policies in this section govern the Committee's procedural guidelines regarding the continuing accreditation of educator preparation institutions and their programs.

A. Accreditation Handbook

1. **Accreditation Procedures.** The Accreditation Handbook will include the accreditation policies adopted by the Commission and the accreditation procedures adopted by the Committee on Accreditation.
2. **Standards and Related Questions.** The Accreditation Handbook will include the Common Standards as well as questions to consider. The Handbook will also include information about program standards for Options 1 through 3.
3. **Guidelines for Reports.** The Committee on Accreditation will recommend a format for biennial reports, program documents and institutional self-study reports and other materials such as faculty vitae and course syllabi to be submitted by each institution. The Committee will also provide guidelines for organizing exhibits and ways of facilitating the preparation, organization, and presentation of materials that relate to both the Common and Program Standards.

- B. Accreditation Cycle.** Throughout the seven year accreditation cycle, a range of activities take place at both the program sponsor/institution and the Committee on Accreditation. It is the expectation that program sponsors/institutions collect and analyze data annually. Reports are submitted to the Committee on Accreditation at intervals during the seven year cycle. The Accreditation Handbook includes detailed descriptions and samples of each of the activities that takes place during the seven year cycle.

Annual Data Gathering and Analysis: The institution or program sponsor will collect data related to candidate competence on an annual basis.

Continuing Program Reports (2nd, 4th, and 6th years of accreditation cycle): The institution reports the types of findings for each program for the current and prior year to the COA. Each report includes a brief statement of analysis and an action plan based on the analysis. Each institution or program sponsor also submits an institutional summary identifying trends across the programs or critical issues. The COA/CTC staff reviews the biannual reports. If the report is not submitted, is incomplete or is inadequate, CTC staff will contact the institution/program. If the report has been submitted but the data do not demonstrate measures of candidate competence or has deficiencies, COA/CTC staff will request additional information from the institution/program. Upon review of the response from the institution if deficiencies are identified, the COA may request additional information or even schedule a program review or a site visit prior to the scheduled time period.

**Accreditation System
Structure and Cycle**

	Institution or Program Sponsors			Commission on Teacher Credentialing COA and/or Staff will Review
	At the Institution	Submit to CTC/COA		
Year A	Data Gathering & Analysis			Although no formal report, institution may be completing follow-up from site visit in Year F. Data gathering and analysis is on-going for use during this cycle.
Year B	Data Gathering & Analysis	Biennial Report (Years 1 & 2)		• Biennial Data Report: if warranted, questions could trigger staff or site visit.
Year C	Data Gathering & Analysis, prepare program update			No report, data gathering and analysis is on-going at the institution
Year D	Data Gathering & Analysis	Biennial Report (Years 3 & 4)	Program Review Document	• Biennial Data Report: if warranted, questions could trigger staff or site visit. • Program review teams review each program’s documentation and pose questions for institution. • Program review teams agree on preliminary findings for program standards.
Year E	Data Gathering & Analysis, prepare self-study		Response to questions on program review	• Program review teams submit preliminary findings and remaining questions or concerns to the COA. • COA determines which, if any program(s) need to be included in the site visit.
Year F	Data Gathering & Analysis	Biennial Report* (Years 5 & 6)	Common Standards Self-Study	• Site team is provided with preliminary findings from program review teams and all previous documentation (data reports) from this cycle. • Site team visits the institution reviewing all Common Standards and any area identified by the Program Reviews. • Team submits an accreditation report to COA. • COA makes an accreditation decision.
Year G**	Data Gathering & Analysis		Follow-up to site visit	• COA reviews follow-up, if warranted, asks further questions. Follow up may exceed one year at the discretion of the COA.

* Data related to approved subject matter programs is submitted in Year F

**After completing the seven year cycle, the institution begins the cycle again

Continuing Program Accreditation (4th year of accreditation cycle):

Each program that is offered by an institution/program sponsor must submit an updated version of its approved program document including up to date syllabi. The update will detail all modifications in the program since its approval. In addition, the candidate assessments, rubrics, and scoring procedures that generated the data gathered over the current year and previous three years must be submitted. In its program document, the institution indicates the standard options it has selected for each credential program in the accreditation review.

Continuing Institutional Accreditation (6th year of accreditation cycle):

An accreditation team visits each institution or program sponsor in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. Prior to the visit, the institution submits a self-study that responds to the Common Standards. The institution prepares for a site visit that focuses mainly on the Common Standards, but includes students, graduates, and faculty as well as other stakeholders from all programs that are sponsored by the institution. The site review team, composed of 3 to 6 members, focuses on the Common Standards plus any program areas directed to be reviewed by COA as a result of the program review. Within the site visit, each program in operation participates fully in the interview schedule. The COA may add additional members to the team with expertise in the program area(s) to be reviewed at the site visit. The site review team submits a report with program findings and an accreditation recommendation to the COA. It is possible that the site visit team may uncover a program concern or issue not previously identified by the program reviewers. In so doing, the team may recommend a follow up focused program review of the concerns or issues that have arisen. In this event, there would be no accreditation recommendation until after the focused review has been completed. The COA will review the team report prior to making an accreditation decision. When follow-up is required, the COA indicates what follow-up is required and establishes an appropriate timeline.

C. Continuing Program Reports (Biennial Data Report)

- 1. Biennial Report.** Each approved preparation program must collect data related to standard(s) annually and submit a biennial report. The specific requirements of the report are defined in the Accreditation Handbook and the titles to the sections of the report are found below:
 - I. Contextual Information
 - II. Candidate Assessment/Performance Information
 - III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment
 - IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance
 - V. Institutional Summary and Plan of Action—Only one from each institution
- 2. Institutional Summary.** All program reports from the institution are submitted together with an institutional summary. The institutional summary identifies trends across the programs or critical issues for the program sponsor.
- 3. Review of Information.** The Commission staff reviews the Biennial Data Reports for completeness and sufficiency. Data review procedures are governed by the Accreditation Handbook.

4. **Action by Committee on Accreditation.** Based on review of the biennial report, the Committee on Accreditation may request additional information or schedule a site visit.

D. Continuing Program Accreditation (Program Document Review)

1. **Updated Document.** The institution or program sponsor will submit an updated version of the most recently approved program document for each of its approved programs to the Commission for review. In addition, current course syllabi, faculty matrix, and criteria for selection of faculty must accompany the document. Specific requirements for the document and examples are contained in the Accreditation Handbook.
2. **Data considered during the program review.** The Biennial Reports from the current accreditation cycle are included in the program review process. In addition, the selected candidate assessments, rubrics, and scoring procedures that generated the data gathered over the current year and previous three years must be submitted with the updated document.
3. **Review of Information.** The program review team reviews all information submitted in the program document and Biennial reports for the program. The program review team may raise questions or request additional information from the program sponsor. The program review team considers all information and comes to “preliminary findings” for all program standards as well as recommendations and questions for the site visit. Document review procedures are governed by the Accreditation Handbook.
4. **Program Review Information Guides Site Visit.** The report from the program review team is forwarded to the Committee on Accreditation. The program review team submits any additional questions or areas of concern to the Committee on Accreditation and Committee on Accreditation will ensure that the site review team investigates the issue(s). The Committee on Accreditation reviews the preliminary program reports and questions/areas of concern to assist in determining the size and composition of the site review team.

E. Continuing Institutional Accreditation (Site Visit)

1. **Preliminary Report.** No less than twelve months before the scheduled site visit, institutional officials submit a Preliminary Report to the Commission. This brief report describes the institutional mission and includes information about institutional demographics, special emphasis programs, and other unique features of the institution. In the Preliminary Report, the institution includes its response to accreditation preconditions established by state laws and the Commission. The Committee on Accreditation uses the Preliminary Report, along with the report from the Program Document Review to determine the type, size and complexity of the programs to be reviewed and the structure, size and expertise of the review team to be selected.

2. **Report of Program Document Review.** No less than twelve months before the scheduled site visit, the program reviewers will submit the preliminary findings on program standards and any additional questions or areas of concern to the COA. The program reviewers make a recommendation to COA whether the issue(s) needs to be further reviewed at the site visit. The COA will consider the recommendation and in so doing, will determine the nature of the program review (size and composition of the team) that will take place during the site visit.
3. **Institutional Self Study.** No fewer than 60 weekdays before the site visit, the institution mails sufficient copies of its Institutional Self-Study Report to the team leader and the Commission staff consultant, who distributes copies of the report to each accreditation site team member. In responding to each applicable standard, the self-study report should emphasize quality considerations, educational rationales, and thoughtful program analyses.

4. The Site Visit

- a. **Collection of Information.** The accreditation site visit team gathers information about the quality of the education unit and credential programs at the institution from a variety of sources, including written documents and interviews with institutional administrators, program faculty, enrolled candidates, field supervisors, recent graduates, employers of graduates, and program advisors. Data collection procedures are governed by the Accreditation Handbook.
- b. **Procedural Safeguards.** The accreditation site visit team provides ample opportunities during the site review for representatives of the institution (a) to be informed about areas where the standards appear not to be fully satisfied, and (b) to supply additional information pertaining to those standards. These opportunities include, at a minimum, a meeting at approximately mid-visit between representatives of the team and the institution's credential programs, after which additional written information or interviews are utilized by the team in reaching its conclusions.
- c. **Specialized Credential Program Team.** If the accreditation site visit team determines that the team lacks sufficient time and/or expertise to make sound recommendations for a particular program, the leader may call for a specialized credential program team to be named to resolve the uncertainty before the accreditation team's final report and recommendation is submitted to the Committee on Accreditation.
- d. **Exit Interview and Report.** The accreditation site visit team conducts an exit interview with representatives of the institution, at which time the team presents its findings and recommendations in the form of a draft report to the Committee on Accreditation. If a specialized credential program team has been called for, the accreditation status recommendation is not reported during the exit interview.

5. Accreditation Reports, Recommendations and Decisions

- a. **Accreditation Team Reports.** Accreditation site visit team makes its report and recommendations to the Committee on Accreditation. Accreditation site visit team reports indicate whether each applicable standard is met, include summary findings and a recommendation to the Committee, and may include educational recommendations for consideration by the institution.
- b. **Accreditation Team Recommendations.** An accreditation site visit team recommends Accreditation, or Accreditation with Stipulations, or Denial of Accreditation. The team makes its recommendation based on the overall quality of the education unit and the credential programs at the institution. The team does not recommend separate accreditation decisions for each program. The team may recommend Accreditation but recommend required follow-up for the institution and/or one or more of its programs. Alternatively, a team may recommend Accreditation with Stipulations, which may (if adopted by the Committee) require the institution to fulfill all standards within a specified time not to exceed one year. Stipulations may (if adopted) require the discontinuation of severely deficient programs at the institution.
- c. **Accreditation Decisions.** After reviewing the recommendation of an accreditation team and an appropriate response from the institution (see below), the Committee on Accreditation makes a decision about the accreditation of educator preparation at the institution, including a decision about the status of each credential program. The Committee makes one of three decisions pertaining to each institution: Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, or Denial of Accreditation. The Committee's Annual Accreditation Reports summarize these decisions.
- d. **Required Follow-up.** The Committee on Accreditation may grant full accreditation to an institution, but require follow-up by one or more programs or the institution as a unit. The required follow-up will be documented in reports submitted to the Committee..
- e. **Accreditation with Stipulations.** The Committee on Accreditation allows an institution up to one calendar year to fulfill all standards or to discontinue deficient program(s). The Committee also determines how the institution's response to adopted stipulations is to be reviewed. The Committee may require a second visit for this purpose. Failure to satisfy all stipulations may result in the denial of accreditation to the entire institution. Upon the request of an institution, an additional period to remedy severe deficiencies may be granted by the Committee on Accreditation if the Committee determines that (a) substantial progress has been made and/or (b) special circumstances described by the institution justify a delay.

F. Appeals

- 1. **Appeals to Committee on Accreditation.** Within twenty weekdays after an accreditation visit, the institution may submit evidence to the Committee on Accreditation that the team demonstrated bias or acted arbitrarily or capriciously or contrary to the policies of this Framework or the procedural guidelines of the Committee. (Information related to the quality of a program or the education unit that was not previously provided to the accreditation team

may not be considered by the Committee.) The Committee may use this evidence to make a different decision than was recommended by the team. If the Committee makes such a decision, the leader of the team may file a dissent with the Commission. If the Committee decides that an incorrect judgment was made by a team or cluster, and that the result leaves some doubt about the most appropriate decision to be made, the Committee may assign a new team to visit the institution and provide a recommendation on its accreditation.

2. **Appeals to the Commission.** Pursuant to Education Code Section 44374-e, an institution has the right to appeal to the Commission a decision by the Committee on Accreditation to deny accreditation or accredit with stipulations. Such an appeal must be based on evidence that accreditation procedures by the team or decisions by the Committee were arbitrary, capricious, unfair, or contrary to the policies in this Framework or the procedural guidelines of the Committee. Information related to the quality of a program or the education unit that was not previously provided to the accreditation team may not be considered by the Commission. The Commission resolves each appeal pursuant to Education Code Section 44372-f.

- G. **Concerns about Credential Program Quality.** When one or more complaints about a credential program indicate that the quality of the program may be in serious jeopardy, the Executive Director of the Commission may investigate the basis for the concerns, provide technical assistance to the institution, or refer the concerns to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration of possible action.

Section 7

Articulation between national and state accreditation

A. Merged California-National Accreditation ~~Teams and~~ Reviews

~~When the above conditions are met for accreditation of an education unit by a national accreditation body,~~ An institution may apply for a merged team and visit for state and national accreditation under the Common Standards and the applicable Program Standards. In a merged visit, a single accreditation team serves the state and national accrediting bodies. The following policies apply:

1. The team has two co-leaders, one appointed according to state accreditation procedures and one appointed by the national accrediting body.
2. The Common Standards and groups of programs are reviewed by appropriate clusters of reviewers selected by the team co-leaders and the Commission's staff consultant. The cluster of members to review the Common Standards includes members appointed by the national body and at least one California member selected according to state accreditation procedures. ~~Clusters of members to review the applicable Program Standards are selected according to Section 5 of this Framework.~~
3. The national accrediting entity agrees to use the Common Standards that have been adopted by the Commission.
4. The accreditation process of the national entity includes on-site reviews.
5. Accreditation teams represent ethnic and gender diversity, and include elementary and secondary school practitioners and postsecondary education members; a minimum of one voting member of each team is from California.
6. For continuing national and state accreditation in California, the national entity agrees to appoint a team that is equivalent in size and structure to an initial accreditation review team.
7. The period of accreditation is consistent with a ~~five-year to~~ seven-year cycle, or is compatible with the accreditation cycle established by the state.

B. Independent National Accreditation of an Education Unit

Upon the request of an institution, the accreditation of an education unit (school, college or department of education) by a national accrediting body *shall* ~~will~~ substitute for state accreditation under the Common Standards provided that the Committee on Accreditation certifies to the Commission that the national accrediting entity fulfills the following conditions (Ed code 44374 (f)):

1. The national accrediting entity agrees to use the Common Standards that have been adopted by the Commission.
2. The accreditation process of the national entity includes on-site reviews.
3. Accreditation teams represent ethnic and gender diversity, and include elementary and secondary school practitioners and postsecondary education members; a minimum of one voting member of each team is from California.
4. For continuing national and state accreditation in California, the national entity agrees to appoint a team that is equivalent in size and structure to an initial accreditation review team.
5. The period of accreditation is consistent with a ~~five-year to~~ seven-year cycle, or is compatible with the accreditation cycle established by the state.

C. National Accreditation of a Credential Program

Upon the request of an institution, the accreditation of a credential program by a national accrediting entity will substitute for state review of the program provided that the Committee on Accreditation certifies to the Commission that the national accreditation entity satisfies the following conditions.

1. The accrediting entity agrees to use the adopted California Program Standards for the specific credential under Option 1, or the standards used by the national entity are determined by the Committee to be equivalent to those adopted by the Commission under Option 1.
- ~~2. The accreditation process of the national entity includes an on-site review of the credential program.~~
2. The accreditation team represents ethnic and gender diversity.
3. The accreditation team includes both postsecondary members and elementary and secondary school practitioners; a minimum of one voting member is from California.
4. The period of accreditation is consistent with a ~~five-year to~~ seven-year cycle, or is compatible with the accreditation cycle established by the state.

Section 8

Evaluation and Modification of the Framework

This section governs the evaluation and modification of the *Accreditation Framework*.

A. Evaluation of the Accreditation Framework

1. ~~**Evaluation Design.** The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation are jointly responsible, in consultation with the educational institutions and organizations, for the design of a comprehensive evaluation of accreditation policies and their implementation, and for the selection of an independent evaluator to conduct the evaluation.~~
2. ~~**Formative and Summative Evaluation.** The evaluation design will include formative components to produce early and ongoing information and suggestions about the *Accreditation Framework* and its implementation. The design will also include summative components. The evaluation will include appropriate sample of institutions and accreditation options, and will be based on comprehensive information collected over a period of time that assures that the major features of the accreditation process have been well tested. It is expected that the formative and summative evaluation will be conducted over a four-year time span, beginning when the first institution is reviewed in accordance with this Framework.~~
1. ***Evaluation of Accreditation System.** The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation are jointly responsible, in consultation with the educational institutions and organizations, for establishing, maintaining, and continually refining a system of on-going evaluation of the accreditation system for educator preparation.*
3. **2. Evaluation Report and Recommendations.** A comprehensive evaluation and report and recommendations will be presented to the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation for their consideration. Among other policy issues, the evaluator will recommend whether Option 3 (General Program Standards) should serve, in addition to Option 1 (California Program Standards), as a basis for determining the comparability of standards under Options 2 or 5. *The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation shall implement a process of continual evaluation and improvement to its accreditation system that includes, but is not limited to, the following:*

Survey Data:

The development and distribution of survey instruments that seeks feedback from a broad spectrum of stakeholders BIR members, higher education administrators and faculty, K-12 administrators

and faculty, those involved in induction programs, major educational organizations and state agencies and public officials involved in educational policy, about the efficacy of the Commission's accreditation policies, processes, and procedures.

A summary and analysis of the survey data would be provided to the Committee on Accreditation and shared with the above stakeholders.

The Committee on Accreditation will include the information in a report to the Commission. This information may be included in the annual report to the Commission or in a subsequent report to the Commission. Pursuant to Education Code Section 44373, and as consistent with Section 8, Part B of the Framework, the Committee may include recommendations to the Commission for its consideration.

Other means of evaluation

The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation may develop other vehicles for the purpose of collecting information about the efficacy of its accreditation policies and procedures. These might include focus groups, public forums, complaints received by the Commission, survey data collected by the Commission from new teachers issued initial credentials, an evaluation conducted by independent research organizations, and other means. The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation will involve the above mentioned stakeholders in discussions about the appropriate use of these instruments in evaluating the efficacy of the accreditation system. Should the Commission employ these vehicles, an analysis of the data would be included in the report from COA in accordance with the same general procedure as that used for survey data above.

B. Modification of the Accreditation Framework

1. **General Provisions Regarding Modifications.** The Commission will consult with the Committee on Accreditation and educational institutions and organizations regarding any proposed modifications of the Framework. Modifications will occur in public meetings of the Commission, after the Commission has considered relevant information provided by the Committee on Accreditation, postsecondary institutions, accreditation team members, the Commission's professional staff, and other concerned individuals. The Commission will determine the date when a policy modification is effective.

2. **~~Refinements and Clarifications of the Framework.~~** The Commission may modify the *Accreditation Framework* to refine or clarify its contents, as needed. The Commission retains the authority to reconsider and modify the Program Standards for Options 1, 4, 5 as the need arises.
3. **~~Significant Major Modifications of the Framework.~~** The Commission will maintain without significant modifications the *Framework's* major features and options, ~~including the Common Standards, and Option 3 (General Program Standards), until summative evaluation is completed or~~ ~~until~~ unless there is compelling evidence that a significant modification is warranted. The determination of compelling evidence and the warranted significant modification will be made by the Commission with the concurrence of the Committee on Accreditation and the Chancellor of the California State University, the President of the University of California, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.